DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 222 731 CE 034 205

AUTHOR Latham, Phillip L.
TITLE An Investigation of the Impact of Advisory Committees on Vocational Education in South Carolina.
INSTITUTION South Carolina State Dept. of Education, Columbia.
PUB DATE Mar 81
NOTE 79p.; For related document, see ED 203 170.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Advisory Committees; Educational Research; Evaluation; *Organizational Effectiveness; Secondary Education; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS *Impact; Impact Studies; South Carolina

ABSTRACT

The impact of advisory groups on the vocational education programs in South Carolina was investigated. Information was gathered from 891 advisory members serving on advisory committees and councils for 49 area vocational centers, 6 of which were not utilizing advisory councils. Analysis of the advisory member responses indicated that a majority of the members were not having an impact on vocational education programs. Over two-thirds (70 percent) of the responses were classified as negative or neutral responses (no impact), while 30 percent of the advisory members reported that their committees were having an impact on vocational education programs. Impact was measured by implementation of advisory committee recommendations to vocational education administrators. Differences in program impact as accomplished by advisory councils and advisory committees were also determined. Results indicated a much higher proportion of advisory councils were having an impact on educational programs. Recommendations were made for improving success of advisory groups. (The survey questionnaire and some correspondence are appended.) (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED222731

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE IMPACT OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN SOUTH CAROLINA

Prepared For

The South Carolina Department of Education

March, 1981

Prepared By

Phillip L. Latham

CE 034205

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E L Knight

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND OF THE INVESTIGATION

Introduction

An important tenet of the American education system concerns public involvement. The belief in and use of public input to education systems can be traced from the middle ages to present day. This tenet holds that the public not only has a right and obligation to participate in the education system but that the education system and public both benefit from such interaction.

This benefit and need is exemplified by the vocational portion of our education system. Here, possibly more than in other facets of education, the need for clear communication between training institutions and the public exists. Vocational education must prepare individuals for the world of work so that they are immediately productive. In our complex and rapidly changing business and industrial climate, common sense mandates that an interchange of information between school and work representatives must take place in order to meet the critical requirement that vocational education graduates possess the skills required by business and industry prior to seeking employment.

Vocational education had its official beginning in 1917 with the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act. The Smith-Hughes Act contained the philosophy that vocational instruction should be designed to lead to employment in recognized occupations. In 1963 the most significant legislation since the Smith-Hughes Act was passed. This act, known as the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (PL 88-210), was extremely important because it represented the first major modernization as expansion of vocational education legislation.

One important change brought about by the Vocational Education Act of 1963 was that it provided for the creation of a state advisory council. The Act specified that the State Advisory Council would advise the State Board for Vocational Education in the administration of the state vocational program. The Vocational Education Act of 1963 further specified that the advisory council be made up of "persons familiar with the state and a person or persons representative of junior colleges, technical institutes or other

institutions of higher education which provide programs of technical or vocational training".[1] This reference to an advisory committee made up of people knowledgeable in the vocational education occupational fields exhibits the federal intent that vocational education programs provide training to individuals that makes them immediately productive upon initial entry into the labor market.

In 1968 Congress passed Public Law 90-576 informally called the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. This Act was a direct result of the realization that changes in industry and business were taking place with such rapidity that some vocational education offerings were not keeping pace. In concert with the expressed congressional interest in vocational education, the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 established the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education. This council, with membership determined by the President, was created in order to better enable vocational education programs to maintain currentness with the demands of business and industry. Similar in concept to the state advisory councils created by the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 specified that membership on the National Advisory Council should include persons with experience in management and labor. Again, Congress was expressing its confidence in lay advisory committees at the national and state levels for their abilities to strengthen vocational education programs and to maintain the relevance of these programs with the fast changing business climate. The Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 further specified that grant monies would only be provided to those states that established state advisory councils. The wording in the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 concerning the establishment of state advisory councils was much stronger than what was stated in the Vocational Education Act of 1963, with the Act of 1968 even detailing the duties of the state advisory council. These duties now included advising the state board on policy matters, evaluation of vocational education programs, preparation of an annual evaluation report on vocational education programs, services, and activities, and recommending changes in the programs and services that are noted in the evaluation process.

In 1976, Congress saw the need for further refinements to vocational education and passed Public Law 94-482. This act revised the Vocational Education Act of 1963. The general thrust of PL 94-482 was to "extend, improve, and where necessary, maintain existing programs of vocational

education".[2] In addition to the usual funding extensions and funding improvements, PL 94-482 again expanded congressional emphasis and stated confidence in advisory committees. In this instance, the Congress tied the receipt of federal assistance to a mandate that all states receiving federal funds "shall establish a local advisory council to provide such agency with advice on current job needs and on the relevancy of courses being offered by such agency in meeting such needs".[2] This legislation increased dramatically the emphasis on utilizing advisory councils in vocational education by specifying that committees would be utilized at the local level; and that advisory councils/committees could be established for each program area if the needs so dictated.

For clarity, a distinction between advisory councils and advisory committees seems appropriate. The term "advisory council" as used in federal legislation refers to those groups of citizens that are mandated by law. Advisory councils are mandated where funds are utilized in school programs. Typically, a single advisory council is established for each institution. The duties of this council are to provide advice on overall program policy. The term "advisory committee" refers to those voluntary groups that provide advice at the program level. Typically, an advisory committee is established for each program area. This distinction between the two advisory groups is becoming less clear as state laws are being changed to mandate the use of advisory committees as well as advisory councils. Seemingly, the more reliable distinction may rest with the number of each type committee located within an institution and the level or detail of programmatic advice offered by the committee.

The results of the combined federal, state, and local government emphasis on vocational education has been the rapid expansion of vocational education program offerings, improvement in the relevancy of course offerings, significant growth in the number of students utilizing vocational education opportunities, and the almost national adoption of the local advisory concept. The instances where citizen advisory committees are not established are rare. More notably, the attitude toward citizen advisory committees has become one of "if some citizen participation is good for the school, more citizen participation is better; and if one citizen advisory committee is worth setting up, then a dozen, or a score, are worth even more".[3] The debate over whether to set up citizen advisory committees has subsided, and

the discussion now centers on how expansive should the duties of these citizen bodies be. As originally conceived, these citizen advisory groups were to assume advisory duties only. However, investigation reveals that committees have, in many cases, become an operational body as well as a consultative body. It becomes apparent, after reviewing the vast list of duties performed by today's local advisory committees, that some school officials have recognized that the membership on local advisory committees represents a wealth of talent that is willing to work.

Even in an advisory role, local advisory committees are a powerful group whose recommendations are usually taken seriously. The expertise and experience represented by the local advisory committees adds to the ability of schools to cope with the problems. Responses to local advisory committee involvement in school affairs (even of an advisory nature) are generally good, although in a few instances, school administrations resent the intrusion of private citizens in school matters. The frequency of this type of reaction is low (about 2%) and in many cases is a result of unfamiliarity with local advisory committees and a lack of expertise on how to best use them. The rapid expansion in the duties and number of committees is vivid testimony to the confidence that school and government officials have in advisory committees.

South Carolina vocational education officials publicly support the concept of citizen involvement and state that "The State Board of Education endorses and supports the basic intent of Public Law 94-482 to improve state vocational planning by involving a wide range of agencies and individuals concerned with education and training within South Carolina in the development of vocational education plans".[4]

State policy concerning the use of advisory committees goes one step beyond what is required by law. In addition to complying with PL 94-482 by requiring all eligible institutions to establish a local advisory council, South Carolina state vocational education officials mandate that craft (local) advisory committees be utilized as well. The South Carolina policy is "each vocational service area and each program area within the Trade and Industrial service area receiving any type of vocational financial assistance through a local educational agency, shall establish a craft advisory committee for each service/program area. The duties of the specialized craft advisory committees shall be to advise the respective instructor(s) and school or area vocational center administrator(s) on: 1) the relevancy

of curriculum offerings; 2) availability of jobs; 3) the adequacy of equipment and materials; and 4) assist in the placement of students on jobs. The craft advisory committee shall meet no less than twice per year".[4]

Statement of Problem

The central question to be answered in this research study is: Are advisory committees having an impact on the vocational education programs in South Carolina?

Delimitation of the Problem

The study was limited to determining if advisory committees were having a measurable impact on vocational education programs in South Carolina. The study did not attempt to analyze the quality of advisory committee membership or operation. Additionally, the study did not attempt to defend or attack the basic concept of the advisory committee function.

Significance of the Problem

South Carolina, as well as the nation, is committed to the concept that advisory committees have a positive impact on vocational education programs. Recent statistics indicate that more than 2,200 citizens are serving as advisory committee members in South Carolina vocational education programs. Vocational education employees and lay committee members invest thousands of man-hours annually endeavoring to improve vocational education programs throughout South Carolina.

Education research literature is replete with articles covering virtually every topic cogent to the efficient formation and operation of advisory committees. With such a national, state and local investment of all types of valuable resources for the advisory committee function, it is difficult to believe that almost no formal evaluation data of advisory committee impact is available. In an era of scarce resources where virtually all expenditures are balanced against gains derived from each expenditure, the investment in advisory committees has somehow escaped the educators' measure of efficiency. In light of these considerations, it is felt that there is a need to know if these advisory committees are having an impact on the vocational education programs in South Carolina.

Previous Studies in South Carolina

Study #1

South Carolina was one of the first states to initiate a formal study of the effectiveness of local advisory committees. In 1974, a study was conducted in an effort to gain information in two primary areas of interest. First, information concerning the makeup of the South Carolina Advisory Committees was needed. This information would include data concerning the membership profile and operating procedures for these committees. Secondly, the study attempted to measure the degree of effectiveness these committees were having on vocational education programs.

The South Carolina study derived its data solely by means of a questionnaire survey of 50% of the local advisory committee membership. The mailing information for these committee members was obtained from each vocational center director.

The criteria established to determine which advisory committees were effective and which were not was based on committee members' responses to questions relating to small group operation. Areas covered in these questions included: a determination of the number of meetings held annually, the percentage attendance by committee members, the determination of whether recorded minutes were kept, and other administration functions normally performed by organized small groups.

The results of this study indicated that 29 out of 42 vocational education centers in South Carolina were utilizing local advisory committees. Questionnaires were mailed to 135 randomly selected committee members and 104 responses were returned. This amounted to a seventy-seven percent response. Thirty-seven persons responding to the survey indicated that "they did not believe they were members of any committee".[7]

Based on the results received concerning committee operation, only eight committees out of twenty-nine surveyed were judged by the South Carolina researchers to be operating effectively. An additional five committees were rated as being moderately effective. Fifty-two percent, or fifteen of twenty-nine committees, were found to be non-effective by this study. Several of the ineffective committees existed only on paper.

In summary the South Carolina study indicated that 69% of the vocational education institutions were utilizing local advisory committees, yet, only 45% of these committees were operating effectively. The majority of the local advisory committees were considered to be non-functioning. The South

Carolina study resulted in several recommendations for the improvement in the operation of these committees. Recommendations included: efforts should be made to activate those committees that are non-functional; written guidelines for committee role and responsibility be formulated; an appropriate set of administrative operation guidelines be prepared for committee use; workshops be conducted to provide training and orientation for advisory committee members; and that the state advisory council should take a more active role in keeping advisory committee members better informed.

An appraisal of the 1974 South Carolina study clearly reveals that the advisory committees were not functioning effectively. This appraisal takes into account the definition of effectiveness utilized by the South Carolina researchers and also the definition of effectiveness wherein committees are judged by their influence on programs. The data clearly indicate that the majority of the South Carolina advisory committees were not operating effectively.

Study #2

In 1979, a study of the advisory council operation in South Carolina was undertaken. The primary purpose of this investigation was to determine the degree of compliance with legislative mandates as contained in Section 6 of the Education Finance Act of 1977. Among other things, Section 6 dealt with establishment of advisory councils at each school in each school district. Additionally, Section 6 deliniated the role such advisory councils should play. This investigation was confined to mandated advisory councils and did not deal with voluntary advisory committees. This study was primarily concerned with the functions being performed by the councils as perceived by four groups: principals, board members, superintendents, and advisory committee members.

The investigation was conducted by means of a statewide survey of 30 superintendents, 60 school board members, 60 principals, and 180 advisory council members. Data were collected via group meetings involving representatives from each of the groups named above and by questionnaire.

The main thrust of the questionnaire was to gather input from the represented groups. Each respondent was asked to choose which of twenty-one council functions were most appropriate. Comparison of answers indicates there is no clear agreement among these represented groups concerning the role of the council member.

All four groups identified four functions as being most important. These included: 1) identifying general community concerns, 2) identifying community priorities for addition to curriculum, 3) identifying community priorities for emphasis within existing curriculum, and 4) reviewing and recommending changes in school board policies. Additionally, the four groups agreed on the least appropriate functions for advisory councils. These least appropriate functions for advisory councils included: 1) specifying characteristics of job applicants, 2) participating in hiring, and 3) recommending hiring policies to the board.

On other issues there was not a uniform pattern of support. Data showed that on particular issues there was wide disagreement on the appropriateness of certain functions for advisory councils. Concerning the appropriateness of councils' involvement in determining if student achievement is lower than it should be, principals and superintendents were in agreement that this was not an appropriate function for council involvement. Council members, on the other hand, ranked this function quite high (ranked third by council members and ninth and eleventh by superintendents and principals, respectively, from a questionnaire containing 21 choices). Another area of nonagreement concerned councils' involvement in studying test data that compared one school to another. Principals were not supportive of councils performing this function; whereas council members and superintendents were in agreement on the relative appropriateness of this function.

The general pattern of answers received from the four groups suggests that noncouncil members felt that functions involving policy making (deciding about "ends") are more appropriate for council members than functions involving administration (deciding about "means"). An important implication of this response is that noncouncil members are more supportive of functions that are general in nature and less supportive of council functions that are more specific in nature. This indication could have important implications on the future of South Carolina advisory council effectiveness. In the recent study completed by the Institute for Responsive Education, the authors found nationwide that a primary cause of advisory councils' failure to function effectively was the lack of specific functions and specific goals. The response of South Carolina educators and board members may be an indication of a resistance to designating specific functions to advisory councils. This feeling on the part of the educators and board members is

evidenced by their choice of the most appropriate functions for council members. Four of the top five functions are of a service role for council and lack the specificity discussed in the Institute for Responsive Education study.

Another significant finding of this study is that of the four groups defining council functions, the school board members were the least certain about what council functions were most appropriate. Conversely, the data indicated that superintendents were the most certain as to what functions were most appropriate. Additionally, superintendents were more supportive of certain council functions than were the council members themselves.

The relationship between councils and school principals is one of less support for council role. In the area of student discipline and achievement the councils indicated an interest to become more involved while principals indicated a desire for less council involvement. Sovde, the author of the South Carolina study, makes the assumption that this insecure behavior on the part of principals may be due to a lack of control over the final product and the belief that the public is looking for a scape goat. Sovde notes that this feeling is unwarranted. A telephone survey of 500 persons in 1980 indicated that although those polled felt that public education needs vast improvements, "most respondents were willing to spend more tax dollars to improve public education and they rejected cuts in all categories of public education spending".[8] The poll also asked respondents "what person or group do you hold most responsible for assuring that we have good public schools?" The most frequent response was parents, educators, politicians, and school board members; all received an equal percent of responses (25%) concerning question number 2 in the telephone poll. Sovde's data is supported by a 1980 survey conducted by the University of South Carolina Professor Charles B. Tyler who reported that the first priority noted by citizens for improvement were public schools. Additionally, Professor Tyler noted "a clear majority did not favor tax reductions".[9]

It seems reasonable that if the role of advisory council members in South Carolina is not clear to the principle players, then the chance for these councils to perform an effective function, as mandated, is questionable. The adage "if you don't know where you're going, the chances of getting where you want to be are very small", seems to apply to the situation in South Carolina as reported in this study.

Study #3

The most recent study available, concerning advisory council effectiveness, was published on December 16, 1980. This study was performed by the South Carolina General Assembly Legislative Audit Council. The impetus for this study stems from Section 59-20-60 of the Education Finance Act. This section referred to school advisory councils, annual school reports, and annual district plans. Interpretation of the intent of this South Carolina legislation is "to provide a method of linking the community with the school and education process. Implementation of these linkages should promote confidence in public education by allowing those who have an investment in the system to participate in planning, monitoring, and evaluation."[10]

Although this study did not focus primarily on measuring the effectiveness of advisory councils, several questions asked during the investigation provided information that permitted such evaluations to take place. The primary method of data collection, concerning advisory councils, was through interviews with administrators, staff, and teaching personnel.

Several problems were enumerated in the Legislative Audit Council report. These were: 1) advisory councils had experienced poor leadership, 2) advisory council members experienced difficulty in understanding school budgets and programs, 3) training of advisory committee members appears to be insufficient to cope with some of the duties expected of committee members, 4) record keeping procedures vary from council to council, 5) standard report formats have not been established, 6) guidelines have not been established for a uniform council fiscal year, 7) the timing established for advisory council reports is inefficient for the productive use of these reports, and 8) communication between advisory councils and school boards is inadequate.

As result of these findings, the Legislative Audit Council made several recommendations to rectify these problems. The primary recommendation proposed that a set of guidelines be established that would cover such items as record keeping, advisory council membership term, the establishment of an advisory council fiscal year schedule, and a more detailed explanation of the proper role of the school district in its relationship with the advisory councils.

The study by the Legislative Audit Council points out that the advisory councils in South Carolina are not functioning as efficiently as they could

be. The findings support other studies that have shown that stronger central government control may be necessary before advisory councils will operate effectively.

CHAPTER II

STUDY DESIGN

Introduction

The investigation into the impact of advisory groups on vocational education in South Carolina was confined to the first level of education research, commonly referred to as normative research. Normative research was especially adaptive to 'this investigation' because of its inherent quality to answer the question 'what is'.

The investigation approach utilized in this study differs substantially from the various approaches used by other states. Several states did not undertake formal investigations of their advisory group systems. These states relied instead on intuitive judgment and informal evaluations to determine the health of their advisory groups. In contrast, this investigation is based on a detailed study that gleaned valuable information from advisory group members and vocational education employees. A second major difference is that this investigation involved a substantially greater proportion of the advisory member population than did most of the other studies. This investigation provided the opportunity for all known advisory group members to participate in the survey. In contrast, other studies, with one exception, utilized a small sample of advisory group members. A third difference between this investigation and the other studies discussed involved the scope of the investigation. All other studies attempted to evaluate either advisory councils or advisory committees whereas this investigation evaluates the impact of both advisory groups. This is an important distinction due to the potential impact that both advisory groups have on vocational education programs.

Finally, a significant difference between this investigation and the other studies involves the method of determining advisory group impact. Other studies utilized approaches such as intuitive evaluations, self-appraisals by advisory group members and evaluation of impact by vocational education administrators. This investigation measures impact by determining if recommendations of the advisory groups resulted in changes in the vocational education programs.

Methodology

At the time of this study, South Carolina had fifty-seven area vocational education centers in operation throughout the state. Area vocational centers were located in virtually every county of the state and offered a variety of vocational education programs ranging from six programs of study at the smallest center to twenty-two vocational education programs at the largest center. Given the mandate that each center must utilize an advisory council and given the encouragement by state officials to establish local advisory committees for each vocational education program, the possible number of advisory groups was quite large. In view of this problem, the decision was made to gather the information for this research study through a mail survey of advisory members.

Advisory member mailing information was secured from each area vocational center director. In making the request for this information, each center director was informed that the data would be used to survey advisory group members from his center. This advisory member data requested from each center director included data for all advisory groups (advisory councils and advisory committees). By requesting this advisory member data just prior to the formal survey and by informing each center director as to the intended use of such data, it was felt that the advisory member data received would be current and accurate. Several center directors responded with a request for additional time to submit the requested data. All requests were granted.

A review of the advisory member data, supplied by the area vocational center directors, indicated that approximately 2,179 persons were serving in an advisory capacity for vocational education programs. It was decided that each advisory member listed would be given the opportunity to respond to the survey. This census of advisory members was considered to be superior to a random sample for several reasons. First, a census of advisory members not only answered the main question posed by this investigation but also provided a more complete demographic profile on committee membership. Secondly, a census provided valuable data as to the degree of compliance by vocational education administrators to the mandating portions of federal and state legislation relating to the formation of advisory groups. Thirdly, the external validity of this study was improved by reducing some error conditions related to sample selection.

Instrument Development Procedures

Several innovative ideas were incorporated into the questionnaire design. First, the initial portion of the questionnaire provided basic instructions and a block to be checked if the respondent felt that he was not a member of a local advisory group. No further action was necessary if the respondent checked the top block. Second, the questionnaire was designed so that the results could be analyzed manually or through automated procedures. This was necessary due to the potentially large amount of data that would have to be processed. It was estimated that a 60 percent response would result in 33,900 individual data elements. Third, the questionnaire was designed so that it provided the opportunity for respondents to write in answers to questions when the printed responses did not meet the respondents requirements.

After many iterations, the questionnaire was submitted to a group of five University of South Carolina professors for their evaluation and comments. Two of the university professors were specialists in education research design. As a result of this collective input, the questionnaire was further refined.

One very difficult aspect in the design of the questionnaire dealt with the problem of ascertaining if the advisory groups were having an impact on the vocational education programs. To measure 'impact' it was decided that the advisory groups would be judged as having an impact if these advisory groups made appropriate recommendations to institution personnel and if these recommendations were accepted by the institution to some degree. The problem of deciding which tasks or areas of recommendation were valid was difficult due to the varying use of such advisory groups by different administrators. Literature review would generally support the view that advisory groups should be judged by their ability to accomplish the goals, objectives, and purposes incorporated within the enabling legislation or other orders establishing such advisory groups. None of the studies reviewed indicated that any reference was made to the written objectives for these advisory committees during the evaluation. South Carolina is one of only a few states that has clearly defined the duties of both advisory committees and advisory councils. The duties for these two types of citizen advisory groups are described in the Education Finance Act of 1977 and in the "State Plan for Technical

and Vocational Education." Numerous other documents, printed by the South Carolina Department of Education, enumerate the duties of these advisory groups as well. With these prescribed duties in mind, a series of questions were formulated which determined if the advisory group had made recommendations concerning vocational education programs to vocational education administrators. Sixteen advisory member duties were listed on the questionnaire as possible responses. The sixteen printed responses provided a comprehensive, appropriate list of task areas that reflected the duties outlined in the enabling legislation and Department of Education publications. Additionally, provisions were made for write-in answers to accommodate areas where recommendations were made and not listed as one of the sixteen printed responses.

The second half of this same question determined whether recommendations had been implemented to some degree. The same list of sixteen task areas was made available to the respondents for selection. Advisory groups which indicated that recommendations had been made and implemented to some degree were judged as having had an impact on vocational education programs. These advisory groups are called 'positive advisory groups' for reporting purposes in this investigation.

Responses from advisory members which indicated that recommendation(s) were made but not accepted were further scrutinized to ascertain if the particular advisory groups were operating efficiently in other respects. This second level of inquiry determined if the advisory group was organized and operating. Determinants of an operating committee included (1) the proportion of advisory members who attended advisory meetings during the past twelve months, (2) the number of meetings held during the past twelve months, (3) whether regular minutes were kept, (4) whether or not the advisory members received a written description of their duties and responsibilities, (5) whether or not the advisory member understood the objectives to be accomplished by the committee, and (6) a self-appraisal by the advisory members which asked if the advisory group was performing a worthwhile function. To be judged as operating but not having an impact, an advisory group had to be making recommendations and answer appropriately on five out of six of the committee operating characteristics noted above. Advisory groups in this category had these characteristics: (1) they were making recommendations, (2) their recommendations were not being implemented,

and (3) they met the criteria of committee process theory. These advisory groups are called 'neutral advisory groups' in this investigation. The decision to judge advisory group operation according to their degree of adherence to committee process theory is sustantiated in the Florida study which concluded that adherence to committee process theory may have enhanced the ability of some advisory groups to achieve their goals. Evidence from that study also indicated that those advisory groups which were not operating effectively expressed the feelings that: they were not organized and were less sure that they knew what their true duties were.

The final category of advisory groups identified in this investigation includes those advisory groups which did not have recommendations implemented and were not operating effectively as determined by the other criteria noted above. These advisory groups are called 'negative advisory groups' in this investigation.

Instrument Field Testing

The questionnaire was field tested at a local vocational high school. The cooperation and help of the center director was utilized to arrange a meeting with a representative group of advisory members serving this institution. The advisory members that aided in the field testing of the questionnaire was a diverse group in terms of council experience, sex, and age with both professional educator and citizen representation.

After all advisory members had completed the questionnaire, each question was discussed thoroughly as to its intended purpose for this investigation and its perceived purpose as judged by the advisory member present. Suggestions made by the advisory members dealt mostly with terminology. No suggestions were made that encompassed major revisions. The suggestions were incorporated wherever feasible (see appendix II).

Data Collection Procedures

For this investigation it was important to be able to distinguish survey responses by institution, by district, and by committee. This provided the capability of reporting results on a detailed as well as a summary basis.

A system was designed to accomplish this detailed level of data distinction in conjunction with the mailing procedures established for the survey. From the list of advisory members supplied by each center

director, a master survey identification file was developed. Each advisory member was assigned an identification number which included an identifier for county, district, institution, committee, and member. Twelve advisory committees and one advisory council were identified by the identification system.

This identification system was utilized for several purposes. First, for mailing purposes, two labels were printed for each advisory member. The data on the label included name, address, and the unique identification number. One label was used to address the survey package to be sent to each advisory member. The second label was used to identify the blank questionnaire included in each advisory member's package. Upon receipt of the completed questionnaire, the member's identification number was keyed with the questionnaire data to form a master record for each respondent. In designing the label program, logic was included to allow for the recognition of the receipt of a questionnaire by a respondent. When the second group of labels was printed for the purpose of prompting a return of questionnaires, labels were produced only for those advisory members who did not respond to the first mailing. Two mailings were planned to gather the data. The time elapsing between the first and second mailing was three weeks. Instructions for completing the questionnaire urged the respondents to complete and return the questionnaire within seven days.

The package sent to each advisory member included a letter of explanation, instructions for completing the questionnaire, a questionnaire (with identification label attached) and a stamped, self-addressed envelope for returning the completed questionnaire.

Data Analysis

Data analysis was performed both manually and through the use of automated procedures. Manual data analysis was necessary where respondents included written responses on the survey questionnaires. Additionally, manual analysis was necessary to make comparisons between positive, neutral, and negative advisory groups.

Survey responses were keyed and entered into a computer file. Major analysis of this computer file was accomplished through the use of a standard statistical computer package called SAS (Statistical Analysis System). The data were analyzed by member advisory group code, advisory group type, and area vocational center.

Results of the data analysis are presented in Chapter III as well as the appendix. Appendix references are included in Chapter III at appropriate points.

CHAPTER III

DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

The results of the data analysis strongly suggest that a sizable number of the citizen advisory committees do not appear to be having an impact on the vocational education programs in South Carolina. The data generated through a survey of advisory committee members were analyzed by individual member response, area vocational center and by advisory committee. The following presents the findings of this analysis.

Population Defined

Advisory committee membership data were requested from fifty-seven area vocational center directors. Forty-nine center directors (86%) responded with name and address data for all advisory members serving these centers. The advisory committee population derived from data received from the fifty-nine area vocational centers indicated that 2,179 persons were serving as advisory committee members. Each advisory committee member was identified by county, district, area vocational center and advisory committee. A classification system was devised for the purpose of this study which provided for the identification of twelve advisory groups (see appendix III). These twelve advisory groups allowed for categorization of approximately seventy vocational advisory committees. Several advisory committees operating within related occupations are grouped for identification purposes. For example, the advisory classification for the trade and industrial group includes the vocational programs in 32 subject areas which includes such varied programs as automotive, machine shop, air conditioning, barbering, and cosmetology.

Analysis of the advisory member data received from the forty-nine area vocational centers indicated that six area vocational centers (12% of the centers responding to the request) were not utilizing advisory councils. This fact is important in light of federal and state mandates that advisory councils be established and utilized. This analysis also revealed that

thirteen area vocational centers were utilizing advisory councils, but were not utilizing craft advisory committees. Thirty area vocational centers reported that they were utilizing both advisory councils and advisory committees (see Table 1).

TABLE 1

AREA VOCATIONAL CENTER RESPONSE

Type of Committee	Number
Craft Committees only	6
Advisory Councils only	13
Both Councils and Committees	30

The number of advisory members reported as serving at the various area vocational centers ranged from as few as five advisory members at one center to as many as 155 at another center. The number of advisory committees in operation at the various area vocational centers ranged from a single committee to as many as seven committees.

All persons reported as serving on advisory committees were included in the survey. A total of 2,179 individual committee members were identified and survey packets were mailed to each person. A total of 1,307 questionnaires were returned as a result of two separate mailings. Those advisory committee members who did not respond to the first survey were mailed a second request. Included among the returned questionnaires were those returned as address unknown, those returned by the respondent indicating that they were not members of an advisory committee and those questionnaires completed by persons who identified themselves as advisory members. All forty-nine vocational centers were identified by the returned questionnaires. Eight hundred seventy-two persons reported as being advisory committee members failed to respond to the survey. Table 2 summarizes the response received from the advisory committee population.

TABLE 2 SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESPONSE

Response Type	Number	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Completed Questionnaires	891	41%	60%
Non-member Responses	283	13%	19%
Address Unknown	133	6%	6%
No Response	872	40%	100%

Table 2 indicates that 13 percent of the reported advisory member population did not feel that they were members of an advisory committee. Additionally, 6 percent of the survey packets were returned due to address unknown. Summing these two categories of responses meant that 19 percent of the advisory member data supplied by the center directors was incorrect. This is an important fact since the advisory member data were obtained just weeks prior to the survey and since the intended use of this data was communicated to each center director.

Questionnaires were completed by 891 respondents. This amounted to a 41 percent response from those identified as being advisory committee members. Every effort was made to insure a good response to the survey. Membership data were obtained from each center director and survey methods were utilized that encouraged individual members to respond. Each potential respondent was informed of the purpose of the survey, assured of the confidentiality of individual responses, and provided with a self-addressed and stamped envelope for returning the completed questionnaire (appendix V). It is significant that 40 percent of the reported advisory member population did not respond to the opportunity to participate in the survey.

Respondents to the survey added written comments to 202 questionnaires. The written comments included additional answers to survey questions and many interesting and enlightening comments concerning advisory committee activities. A sample of these written comments is included in appendix IV).

All survey data received from the returned questionnaires were keyed and entered to create a master file. Questionnaires returned as non-member and address unknown were coded appropriately and entered as part of the master file.

Analysis of the reported advisory member responses indicated that the majority of the reported advisory members were not having an impact on vocational education programs (Table 3). Over two-thirds (70%) of the reported individual responses were classified as negative or neutral responses (no impact), while 30 percent of the advisory members reported that their committees were having an impact on vocational education programs. Impact was measured by determining if the advisory committee had made recommendations to vocational education administrators and that these recommendations had beem implemented to some degree. Table 3 summarizes the results of this analysis of reported advisory committee member responses.

TABLE 3 REPORTED ADVISORY MEMBER POPULATION BY TYPE

Advisory Member	Number	Percent
Positive Advisory Member Observations	376	30%
Neutral Advisory Member Observations	161	12%
*Negative Advisory Member Observations	727	58%

*Includes non-member responses and address unknown responses

Further analysis of individual member responses was performed after eliminating those responses that included "address unknown" data. The negative responses were reduced by 132 responses. Table 4 shows the relationship between the three member classifications after eliminating the data from "address unknown" responses.

TABLE 4 ADVISORY MEMBER CLASSIFICATION BY TYPE RESPONSE FOR THOSE RESPONDING TO THE SURVEY

Response Type	Number	Percent
Positive Advisory Member Observations	376	33%
Neutral Advisory Member Observations	161	14%
Negative Advisory Member Observations	594	53%

Table 4 indicates that, after considering only those questionnaires that were completed and returned by reported advisory members, the majority of the individual responses was classified as negative and that 67 percent of the responses was from committee members reporting that their committee was not having an impact.

Further analysis of the individual member responses was performed after eliminating 283 responses from persons who answered that they were not members of an advisory committee. This meant that the data remaining for analysis consisted solely of those persons who acknowledged that they were members of an advisory committee. Table 5 displays the results of this analysis.

TABLE 5 QUESTIONNAIRES COMPLETED BY RESPONDENTS WHO IDENTIFIED THEMSELVES AS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Type Observation	Number of Observations	Percent
Positive	376	44%
Neutral	161	19%
Negative	311	37%

Table 5 indicates that the majority of those persons who identified themselves as members of an advisory committee did not rate their performance in a manner that would indicate that their committee was having an impact on vocational education programs in South Carolina. Fifty-six percent of the respondents indicated that their committee had not had any recommendations

implemented. Furthermore, 37 percent of the respondents' answers to the questionnaire suggested that their committees were not functioning committees.

Individual respondent results corresponded closely with the results as analyzed by committee. In order to analyze committee data, it was necessary to allow for differences in responses to the same question by members of the same committee. Since each respondent was surveyed individually, variance in response to survey questions had to be accommodated. For this study, inner committee differences were resolved by utilizing the majority of committee member responses to determine the true committee response. If, for example, a committee had eleven persons responding and six committee members answered the question one way, three committee members answered in a different way, and two committee members answered in still a different way, the committee response was said to be determined by the manner in which the six committee members responded. If a clear majority opinion did not exist, i.e., an equal number of respondents chose more than one answer, that question was not considered for that committee. Table 6 displays the results of the committee responses to the survey in reference to committee impact measure.

TABLE 6 STATEWIDE ADVISORY COMMITTEE RESPONSE TO IMPACT MEASURE

Committee Type	Number of Committees	Percent
Positive	49	32%
Neutral	10	6%
Negative	95	62%

Table 6 indicates that less than one third of the advisory committees responding to the survey were having an impact on vocational education programs and that 62 percent of the advisory committees were classified as not functioning as defined in Chapter II of this investigation.

The results identified by advisory committee corresponded closely to the results identified by individual committee member. Table 7 compares the results by individual advisory committee member with the results by advisory committee.

TABLE 7 COMPARISON OF INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES WITH COMMITTEE RESPONSES

	Individual Response		Committee Response	
Type Response	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Positive	376	30%	49	32%
Neutral	161	12%	10	6%
Negative	727	58%	95	62%

Table 7 indicates that the proportional relationship between positive and negative responses was approximately the same for individual member responses and committee responses. The relationship between the neutral category did not appear to correspond as closely as the positive and negative categories; however, this may be explained by the relatively small number of committees and disproportional effect a small change in the number of committees can bring. Fewer than one-third of the advisory committees were judged as having an impact.

Performance of the individual area vocational centers, as it related to the utilization of advisory committees, varied widely. Analysis of the data by area vocational center indicated that numerous area vocational centers exhibited solely negative advisory groups. A smaller number of area vocational centers exhibited only positive advisory groups. Table 8 displays the results of data analysis by area vocational center.

TABLE 8 (AVC) AREA VOCATIONAL CENTERS THAT EXHIBITED ONE TYPE OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Type	Number	Percent
AVC with only positive advisory committees/councils	3	16%
AVC with only neutral advisory committees/councils	2	10%
AVC with only negative advisory committees/councils	14	74%

Table 8 indicates that nineteen AVC's exhibited a single type of advisory group. Of these centers, fourteen or 74 percent contained solely negative groups. Further analysis of these AVC's exhibiting a single type of advisory group allowed certain characteristics to be identified. AVC's exhibiting all or nearly all positive advisory groups achieved a very high survey response rate from their advisory group members. A response rate of greater than 90 percent was not unusual for those centers with positive advisory groups. Conversely, the response rate from AVC's containing solely negative groups was much lower. A response rate of 80 percent was most common for these centers. Response rates of 60 percent or less occurred for several AVC's that had a high proportion of negative advisory groups.

In analyzing differences in advisory group characteristics between area vocational centers exhibiting a substantial proportion of advisory groups as either positive or negative, a common characteristic appeared. Advisory group members of those committees judged as "negative" exhibited a tendency to be unsure of their committee's activities whereas members of positive advisory groups were more sure of what their committee activities encompassed. Table 9 exhibits the relationship between two area vocational centers on specific questions relating to advisory group structure and activity. Table 9 compares responses for area vocational center 'A' which had all negative advisory groups with the responses from area vocational center 'B' which had four positive and one negative advisory group.

TABLE 9 COMPARISON OF RESPONSES FOR TWO AVC'S

Survey Question	AVC A (four neg. adv. com.)	AVC B (four pos. one neg.)
1. Is your committee chairperson an employee of the AVC?	50% not sure	0% not sure
2. Number of persons on your committee	56% not sure	30% not sure
3. Average number of members in attendance at meetings during the past 12 months	56% not sure	0% not sure
4. Number of meetings held during past 12 months	13% not sure	0% not sure

TABLE 9 (continued)

COMPARISON OF RESPONSES FOR TWO AVC'S

Survey Question	AVC A (four neg. adv. com.)	AVC B (four pos. one neg.)
5. Are regular minutes of meetings kept?	60% not sure	0% not sure
6. Do you know the reason for your committee's existence?	6% not sure	0% not sure
7. Are you confident that your advisory committee is performing a worthwhile function?	33% not sure	38% not sure
8. Have you heard of the State Advisory Council for Technical and Vocational Education (SACVTE)?	47% no	14% no
9. Are you aware that the SACVTE will provide technical assistance upon request to the local advisory committees for their operation?	60% no	25% no
10. Has your committee requested such help from the SACVTE?	86% not sure	50% not sure

Table 9 indicates that the members of advisory committees at AVC 'A' were unsure concerning fundamental activities of their advisory committee operation, whereas, the respondents from AVC 'B' were more sure of what was happening in these same areas of advisory committee operation. In other aspects of committee operation, the two AVC's exhibited similar characteristics. Both AVC's recruited their advisory members through direct contact by the center director. Advisory committee members from both centers indicated that the center director attended their advisory committee meetings. One difference in response between the two AVC's concerned the resources used by the advisory committees to improve their performance. Advisory committee members from AVC 'A' indicated that the primary means utilized for self-improvement was literature provided by the vocational center. Advisory committee members from AVC 'B' indicated that the primary resource used for improved committee operations was through review and study of the written guidelines of duties and responsibilities provided by the vocational center.

Another area of data analysis involved a determination of whether differences existed between advisory councils and advisory committees. Of

particular interest was the determination of differences in the impact on vocational education programs for advisory councils and advisory committees as reported in the survey. Table 10 displays the results of this statewide analysis by advisory committee type and by all advisory committees.

TABLE 10

IMPACT COMPARISON BY ADVISORY COMMITTEE TYPE

Committee Type	All Advisory Committees		Advisory Councils		Advisory Com.	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Positive	49	32%	23	53%	26	23%
Neutral	10	6%	5	12%	5	5%
Negative	95	62%	15	35%	80	72%

Table 10 indicates that there were significant differences in the advisory operation between advisory councils and advisory committees. The majority (53%) of the advisory councils statewide were having an impact on vocational education programs they serve, whereas, only 23 percent of the advisory committees were having an impact on vocational education programs. Additionally, approximately one-third (35%) of the advisory councils appeared to be non-functioning in contrast to more than two-thirds (72%) of the advisory committees that were non-functioning. In light of this drastic difference in impact, a comparison of detail data for advisory councils and advisory committees was performed.

Comparison of committee structure and activities indicated that sharp differences existed between positive advisory councils and positive advisory committees. Table 11 illustrates the differences between these two advisory groups.

Table 11 DATA COMPARISON BETWEEN POSITIVE ADVISORY COUNCILS STATEWIDE AND POSITIVE ADVISORY COMMITTEES STATEWIDE

Question	ADVISORY COUNCILS	ADVISORY COMMITTEES
1. Position on committee		
Committee Chairperson	30%	12%
Committee Member	70%	88%
2. Sex		
Male	76%	73%
Female	24%	27%
3. Race		
White	82%	92%
Black	18%	8%
4. Length of committee service		
Less than six months	11%	8%
Six months to one year	10%	7%
One year to two years	35%	32%
More than two years	44%	53%
5. Chairperson is an employee of the AVC		
Yes	17%	39%
No	77%	48%
Not sure	6%	12%
6. Number of persons on committee		
6 or fewer	16%	57%
7 - 12	64%	35%
13 or more	20%	4%
Not sure	-	4%

Question	ADVISORY COUNCILS	ADVISORY COMMITTEES
7. Member attendance at advisory committee meetings during the past 12 months		
1/3 of members of less	3%	7%
1/3 to 1/2 of the members	10%	17%
1/2 to 3/4 of the members	43%	38%
Greater than 3/4 of the members	41%	29%
Not Sure	3%	9%
8. Number of meetings held in the past 12 months		
Zero (no meetings)	1%	2%
1 - 3	58%	75%
4 - 6	29%	16%
7 or more	10%	3%
Not sure	2%	4%
9. Regular minutes kept		
Yes	70%	58%
No	17%	17%
Not sure	13%	25%
10. Written description of duties and responsibilities received		
Yes	56%	53%
No	40%	43%
Not sure	4%	4%
11. Reason for committee existence known by member		
Yes	97%	96%
No	2%	2%
Not sure	1%	2%
12. Confident that the advisory committee performs a worthwile function		
Not confident	12%	8%
Confident	47%	63%
Very confident	41%	29%

Question	ADVISORY COUNCILS	ADVISORY COMMITTEES
13. AVC officials have asked committee for help or suggestions.		
Yes	97%	90%
No	3%	10%
14. Education Officials that have attended advisory committee meetings		
None have attended any meetings	-	2%
Center Director	37%	34%
Program Instructor	22%	37%
State Official	7%	7%
School Superintendent	17%	9%
School Board Member	16%	11%
15. Person contacting you concerning committee membership		
Center Director	82%	35%
Program Instructor	5%	50%
State Official	1%	-
Other Committee Member	1%	2%
School Superintendent	3%	1%
Committee Chairperson	1%	6%
School Board Member	1%	2%
Other - Please specify	6%	4%
16. Committee's typical expenditure on a yearly basis		
We have no budget	44%	45%
Less than $200 annually	9%	9%
From $200 to $500 annually	2%	1%
$500 to $1,000	4%	-
$1,000 to $2,000	-	-
Greater than $2,000	-	-
Not sure	41%	44%

Question	ADVISORY COUNCILS	ADVISORY COMMITTEES
17. Resources your committee has used to improve operating effectiveness		
Literature provided by the vocational center	26%	20%
Written guidelines of duties and responsibilities provided by the vocational center	18%	18%
Participation in faculty training session	5%	5%
Guest Speaker	13%	14%
Training sessions/workshop sessions sponsored by the vocational education center	10%	10%
Participation in various school activities such as open house, discussion with students, etc.	26%	30%
Have not used any resources for improvement	1%	3%
Other - please list	1%	1%
18. Knowledgeable of the State Advisory Council for Technical & Vocational Education (SACVTE)		
Yes	74%	58%
No	26%	42%
19. Aware that SACVTE will provide technical assistance upon request		
Yes	52%	39%
No	48%	61%
20. Committee has requested help from the SACVTE		
Yes	7%	5%
No, but feel help is needed	14%	16%
No, help is not needed	14%	16%
Not sure	65%	62%

The data comparison (Table 11) pointed out differences and similarities between the two advisory groups. Committee membership on both councils and committees was dominated by white males. The majority of the members of both advisory groups had served more than two years as advisory members. The data indicated that the chairperson of the advisory committees was more likely to be an employee of the AVC than was the chairperson of the advisory council. Advisory councils were composed of more members than were advisory committees. Both advisory groups averaged one to three meetings each twelve months; however, a sizable proportion of advisory council members (29%) reported that their council met four to six times a year. Both advisory groups kept regular minutes and both advisory groups were confident that they know the reason for their committee's existence. Additionally, both the advisory councils and advisory committees reported that vocational center officials had asked for help and/or suggestions.

The vocational center representative attending advisory council meetings was usually the center director while the program instructor was the usual representative at advisory committee meetings. Membership determination was accomplished differently for the two advisory groups. Advisory council members were almost always (82%) contacted by the center director, whereas, in the majority of cases, membership on the advisory committee was determined by the program instructor. Both advisory groups indicated that there was no budget for advisory group activities.

Both advisory councils and advisory committees had utilized several methods for improvement of advisory group operations. Participation in various school activities such as open house meetings and discussions with students were the most popular means cited for advisory group improvement. Both advisory groups utilized literature and written guidelines of duties as means of becoming more efficient.

Although both groups were aware of the State Advisory Council for Technical and Vocational Education (SACVTE), neither advisory group indicated that they had utilized this resource to any great extent.

A comparison of positive advisory councils and negative advisory councils was conducted to ascertain if differences existed that might be identified. A comparison of data for positive advisory councils and negative advisory councils indicated that major differences existed between these two advisory groups. Table 12 depicts the similarities and differences between these two groups.

TABLE 12 DATA COMPARISON BETWEEN POSITIVE ADVISORY COUNCILS AND NEGATIVE ADVISORY COUNCILS STATEWIDE

Question	POSITIVE ADVISORY COUNCILS	NEGATIVE ADVISORY COUNCILS
1. Position on committee		
Committee Chairperson	30%	9%
Committee Member	70%	91%
2. Sex		
Male	76%	83%
Female	24%	17%
3. Race		
White	82%	89%
Black	18%	11%
4. Length of committee service		
Less than six months	11%	21%
Six months to one year	10%	24%
One year to two years	35%	29%
More than two years	44%	26%
5. Chairperson is an employee of the AVC		
Yes	17%	46%
No	77%	27%
Not sure	6%	27%
6. Number of persons on committee		
6 or fewer	16%	18%
7 - 12	64%	36%
13 or more	20%	3%
Not sure	-	43%

Question	POSITIVE ADVISORY COUNCILS	NEGATIVE ADVISORY COUNCILS
7. Member attendance at advisory committee meetings during the past 12 months		
1/3 of members of less	3%	12%
1/3 to 1/2 of the members	10%	27%
1/2 to 3/4 of the members	43%	12%
Greater than 3/4 of the members	41%	9%
Not Sure	3%	39%
8. Number of meetings held in the past 12 months		
Zero (no meetings)	1%	-
1 - 3	58%	69%
4 - 6	29%	13%
7 or more	10%	18%
Not sure	2%	-
9. Regular minutes kept		
Yes	70%	15%
No	17%	24%
Not sure	13%	61%
10. Written description of duties and responsibilities received		
Yes	56%	24%
No	40%	67%
Not sure	4%	9%
11. Reason for committee existence known by member		
Yes	97%	85%
No	2%	6%
Not sure	1%	9%
12. Confident that the advisory committee performs a worthwile function		
Not confident	12%	32%
Confident	47%	48%
Very confident	41%	20%

Question	POSITIVE ADVISORY COUNCILS	NEGATIVE ADVISORY COUNCILS
13. AVC officials have asked committee for help or suggestions.		
Yes	97%	74%
No	3%	26%
14. Education Officials that have attended advisory committee meetings		
None have attended any meetings	-	-
Center Director	37%	49%
Program Instructor	22%	36%
State Official	7%	-
School Superintendent	17%	6%
School Board Member	16%	9%
15. Person contacting you concerning committee membership		
Center Director	82%	73%
Program Instructor	5%	13%
State Official	1%	-
Other Committee Member	1%	3%
School Superintendent	3%	-
Committee Chairperson	1%	3%
School Board Member	1%	-
Other - Please specify	6%	7%
16. Committee's typical expenditure on a yearly basis		
We have no budget	44%	50%
Less than $200 annually	9%	3%
From $200 to $500 annually	2%	-
$500 to $1,000	4%	-
$1,000 to $2,000	-	-
Greater than $2,000	-	-
Not sure	41%	47%

Question	POSITIVE ADVISORY COUNCILS	NEGATIVE ADVISORY COUNCILS
17. Resources your committee has used to improve operating effectiveness		
Literature provided by the vocational center	26%	33%
Written guidelines of duties and responsibilities provided by the vocational center	18%	12%
Participation in faculty training session	5%	2%
Guest Speaker	13%	5%
Training sessions/workshop sessions sponsored by the vocational education center	10%	7%
Participation in various school activities such as open house, discussion with students, etc.	26%	26%
Have not used any resources for improvement	1%	12%
Other - please list	1%	2%
18. Knowledgeable of the State Advisory Council for Technical & Vocational Education (SACVTE)		
Yes	74%	51%
No	26%	49%
19. Aware that SACVTE will provide technical assistance upon request		
Yes	52%	39%
No	48%	61%
20. Committee has requested help from the SACVTE		
Yes	7%	3%
No, but feel help is needed	14%	6%
No, help is not needed	14%	6%
Not sure	65%	85%

Analysis of data from Table 12 revealed several significant differences between positive councils and negative councils. Members of positive advisory councils appeared to be more informed about their council activities as well as being more informed on other related aspects of advisory council operation. Members of negative advisory councils showed a much higher degree of uncertainty concerning the operation and structure of their councils.

Positive advisory councils were made up of more experienced members than were negative advisory councils. Seventy-nine percent of the members of the positive councils had been members of the council for more than one year in comparison to the negative councils which had fifty-five percent of its members with an equivalent amount of experience.

Another marked difference between the members of positive councils and those members of negative councils dealt with the proportion of councils that had an employee of the area vocational center as chairman of the committee. Seventeen percent of the positive council members reported that the council chairman was an employee of the education center. In sharp contract, members of the negative advisory councils reported that forty-six percent of their councils had employees of the education center as chairman of the council.

Membership data for negative councils was not as precise due to uncertainty by members of these councils. Forty-three percent of the negative council members were unsure as to how many members were on their council. This fact contrasts sharply with the positive council members who demonstrated no uncertainty in answering questions concerning council membership. Closely related to the question of council membership was the information concerning the average proportion of council members that attended council meetings. Again, the members of the positive councils were more sure of their answers. Eighty-four percent of the respondents from positive councils indicated that members were in regular attendance at council meetings. In contrast, twenty-one percent of the members of the negative councils indicated that at least one half of the council members were in attendance.

Responses from council members on the question of whether or not regular minutes were kept contrasted sharply. Members of positive advisory councils indicated that regular minutes were kept in seventy percent of the cases whereas members of negative advisory councils were unsure and indicated that minutes were kept in only five percent of the cases. Sixty-one percent of the members of negative councils were unsure of their answer on this question.

Another area of inquiry involved the determination of whether council members received written descriptions of their duties and responsibilities as council members. The response from positive council members and negative council members differed by wide margins. Fifty-six percent of the members of positive advisory councils indicated that they had received written descriptions of their duties; however, only twenty-four percent of the members of negative councils received such written descriptions of their duties.

Another area of inquiry included in the questionnaire dealt with the determination of whether the advisory council member knew the reason for the council's existence. Almost all (97%) of the members of positive advisory councils expressed that they knew the reason for their council's existence. Members of negative councils were not as sure. Eighty-five percent of the negative council members felt sure on this question.

When questioned concerning member confidence that their advisory council was performing a worthwhile function, the responses from the two advisory groups contrasted sharply. Sixty-eight percent of the members of negative advisory councils were confident that their council performed a worthwhile function whereas eighty-eight percent of the members of the positive advisory councils were confident that their council performed a worthwhile function.

The survey results indicated several areas of significant differences concerning the degree of involvement by education officials in the operations of advisory councils. Members of positive advisory councils indicated that vocational center officials had asked the council for help or suggestions in ninety-seven percent of the cases. Members of negative advisory councils indicated that vocational center officials had asked for help or suggestions in only seventy-four percent of the cases.

The center director was indicated as the primary contact for both the positive and negative council groups. Another area of difference involved the frequency of contact with program instructors. Council members of negative councils reported a much higher contact rate with program instructors than did respondents from positive councils. Program instructors were indicated as attending council meetings by positive council members in twenty-two percent of the cases whereas negative council members reported program instructors attended their council meetings in thirty-six percent of the cases.

Although members of both positive and negative councils were aware of the existence of the State Advisory Council for Technical and Vocational Education (SACVTE) neither group appeared to be utilizing this resource to improve the council function.

Data comparing committee operations for positive advisory committees and negative advisory committees provided similar findings that were found when positive advisory councils were compared to negative advisory councils (Table 12). The following table (Table 13) depicts the results of the comparison of positive advisory committees and negative advisory committees.

TABLE 13

DATA COMPARISON OF POSITIVE ADVISORY COMMITTEES AND NEGATIVE ADVISORY COMMITTEES STATEWIDE

Question	POSITIVE ADVISORY COMMITTEES	NEGATIVE ADVISORY COMMITTEES
1. Position on committee		
Committee Chairperson	12%	33%
Committee Member	88%	67%
2. Sex		
Male	73%	72%
Female	27%	28%
3. Race		
White	92%	94%
Black	8%	6%
4. Length of committee service		
Less than six months	8%	27%
Six months to one year	7%	14%
One year to two years	32%	32%
More than two years	53%	27%
5. Chairperson is an employee of the AVC		
Yes	39%	37%
No	48%	21%
Not sure	12%	42%

QUESTION	POSITIVE ADVISORY COMMITTEES	NEGATIVE ADVISORY COMMITTEES
6. Number of persons on committee		
6 or fewer	57%	50%
7 - 12	35%	10%
13 or more	4%	2%
Not sure	4%	38%
7. Member attendance at advisory committee meetings during the past 12 months		
1/3 of members of less	7%	13%
1/3 to 1/2 of the members	17%	15%
1/2 to 3/4 of the members	38%	13%
Greater than 3/4 of the members	29%	5%
Not Sure	9%	52%
8. Number of meetings held in the past 12 months		
Zero (no meetings)	2%	18%
1 - 3	75%	52%
4 - 6	16%	2%
7 or more	3%	-
Not sure	4%	28%
9. Regular minutes kept		
Yes	58%	6%
No	17%	26%
Not sure	25%	68%
10. Written description of duties and responsibilities received		
Yes	53%	12%
No	43%	81%
Not sure	4%	7%
11. Reason for committee existence known by member		
Yes	96%	67%
No	2%	18%
Not sure	2	15%

Question	POSITIVE ADVISORY COMMITTEES	NEGATIVE ADVISORY COMMITTEES
12. Confident that the advisory committee performs a worthwile function		
Not confident	8%	44%
Confident	63%	51%
Very confident	29%	5%
13. AVC officials have asked committee for help or suggestions.		
Yes	90%	58%
No	10%	42%
14. Education Officials that have attended advisory committee meetings		
None have attended any meetings	2%	19%
Center Director	34%	30%
Program Instructor	37%	39%
State Official	7%	3%
School Superintendent	9%	3%
School Board Member	11%	6%
15. Person contacting you concerning committee membership		
Center Director	35%	21%
Program Instructor	50%	67%
State Official	-	-
Other Committee Member	2%	1%
School Superintendent	1%	-
Committee Chairperson	6%	3%
School Board Member	2%	1%
Other - Please specify	4%	7%
16. Committee's typical expenditure on a yearly basis		
We have no budget	45%	33%
Less than $200 annually	9%	2%
From $200 to $500 annually	1	-
$500 to $1,000	-	-
$1,000 to $2,000	-	-
Greater than $2,000	-	-
Not sure	44%	65%

Question	POSITIVE ADVISORY COMMITTEES	POSITIVE ADVISORY COMMITTEES
17. Resources your committee has used to improve operating effectiveness		
Literature provided by the vocational center	20%	11%
Written guidelines of duties and responsibilities provided by the vocational center	18%	4%
Participation in faculty training session	5%	5%
Guest Speaker	14%	12%
Training sessions/workshop sessions sponsored by the vocational education center	10%	8%
Participation in various school activities such as open house, discussion with students, etc.	30%	32%
Have not used any resources for improvement	3%	26%
Other - please list	1%	3%
18. Knowledgeable of the State Advisory Council for Technical & Vocational Education (SACVTE)		
Yes	58%	36%
No	42%	64%
19. Aware that SACVTE will provide technical assistance upon request		
Yes	39%	18%
No	61%	82%
20. Committee has requested help from the SACVTE		
Yes	5%	-
No, but feel help is needed	16%	11%
No, help is not needed	16%	7%
Not sure	62%	82%

Positive advisory committees differed substantially from negative advisory committees. One significant difference involved individual committee member experience as an advisory member. Members of positive advisory committees were more experienced advisory committee members. Data analysis revealed that eighty-five percent of the positive advisory committee members had more than one year's experience as a committee member while negative advisory committee members with more than one year's experience accounted for fifty-eight percent of the negative committee population. Another experience factor in favor of the positive advisory committees concerned the proportion of new members on the committees. The proportion of new members, with less than six months' experience, for positive and negative advisory committees was eight percent and twenty-seven percent respectively.

Another area of difference between positive advisory committees and negative advisory committees involved the degree of committee member knowledge concerning their own committee's structure and operations. Negative advisory committee members were less sure of what was happening and how their committee was structured. Negative advisory committee members were unsure of their answers in the following areas to the degree indicated: number of persons on their committee (38 percent unsure), determination if the committee chairperson was an employee of the AVC (42 percent unsure), member attendance at committee meetings during the past twelve months (52 percent unsure), number of meetings held in the past twelve months (28 percent unsure), question concerning the keeping of minutes (68 percent unsure), question concerning the member's knowledge of the reason for the committee's existence (15 percent unsure), and finally, a question concerning whether the member feels confident that his committee performs a worthwhile function (44 percent not confident). In all cases the members of positive advisory committees were more sure of what was happening in these important committee activities.

Another striking difference noted between positive advisory committees and negative advisory committees dealt with member knowledge of his function. Fifty-three percent of the members of positive advisory committees reported that they had received written descriptions of their duties and responsibilities as advisory committee members. In contrast, only twelve percent of the members of the negative committees reported receiving such written descriptions of duties and responsibilities.

When questioned as to what resources had been used to improve the committee's operating effectiveness, both groups reported that participation in school activities was the primary means utilized. Some members from both advisory groups reported that no resources had been used for committee improvement. The proportion of committee members reporting that no resources had been used for self-improvement for positive and negative committee members was three percent and twenty-six percent respectively. Positive committees were utilizing additional help for committee improvement more than negative committees.

A summary of the findings discussed in this chapter as well as conclusions resulting from the data analysis are presented in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The present investigation was designed to answer the central question: "Are advisory committees having an impact on vocational education in South Carolina?" Chapter III presents an amalgamation of the results of the investigation related to the central question. Chapter IV is organized in three parts: (1) a summary of the research findings based on the data presented in Chapter III, (2) a presentation of the conclusions based on the results of the investigation and (3) a presentation of recommendations for further study.

Summary

This investigation was conducted by means of a survey of all reported advisory committee members serving area vocational centers in South Carolina. The data derived from the survey were examined using individual advisory member, advisory committee, and area vocational centers as the units of analysis. Additionally, the data were analyzed by advisory committee type. Two types of advisory committees were identified, advisory councils and craft advisory committees. Craft advisory committees are discussed using the term advisory committees. Advisory councils are referred to as advisory councils or councils.

Advisory councils are those advisory groups that are mandated by state and federal law. Usually, a single advisory council is located at each school. This council provides input for improvement of the overall education program at the school level. Advisory committees were not mandated by law when this investigation took place; however, their use was encouraged at all levels of government. Advisory committees provide input for educational programs at the program level. The usual situation is that several advisory committees serve a single school.

Based on survey data related to the measure of impact on vocational education programs and on the basis of advisory group operating practices,

the advisory groups were segregated into three classifications. Those advisory groups that made recommendations and had their recommendations implemented were classified as "positive" advisory groups. The remaining advisory groups consisted of all advisory groups that were not successful in having their recommendations implemented. This latter group was further subdivided on the basis of their group operating practices. Those advisory groups that appeared to be organized and operating on a regular schedule but did not have any recommendations accepted were classified as "neutral" advisory groups. The advisory groups that appeared unorganized and were not operating on a regular schedule were classified as "negative" advisory groups.

Public Law 94-482, enacted in 1976, requires state governments to establish advisory councils at the local level where the disbursement of federal funds is involved. This act mandated the states to "establish a local advisory council to provide such agency with advice on current job needs and on the relevancy of courses being offered by such agency in meeting such needs."[1] The Act further implied that states were encouraged to establish these councils at the program level if the benefits would justify such action.

State education officials in South Carolina reinforced the federal mandate with the passage of the Education Finance Act of 1977. This Act mandated the establishment of advisory councils at each school and described the role that advisory councils would play. In addition to assisting in the preparation of the annual school report, the advisory councils were directed to study program offerings and make recommendations for improvement based on the needs of the students. The councils also were to propose strategy for the expenditure of funds to achieve specific goals and objectives as related to educational programs.

The impact of advisory councils and advisory committees was measured by determining if the advisory group had made recommendations to education administrators and if these recommendations had been implemented to some extent. Advisory group members taking part in the survey were provided a list of sixteen committee operating areas from which members could choose one or more areas in which recommendations had been made and implemented. The sixteen areas provided to the advisory members for selection were comprised of those areas of responsibilities and duties that could logically be derived from advisory duties as outlined in the Education Finance Act and South Carolina Department of Education publications. Each respondent was also provided the opportunity to add areas

of committee recommendation and implementation in the event that the comprehensive list of sixteen committee operating areas proved insufficient.

It was recognized that advisory groups may have an impact on education programs even though recommendations are not made or implemented. It is logical that advisory groups exert influence simply because they exist; however, this investigation was confined to determining if direct, measureable impact had resulted from the actions of the advisory group.

The initial data analysis dealt with the determination of the makeup of the advisory member population. The data received from forty-nine AVC's indicated that 2,179 advisory members were serving as advisory council and committee members to forty-nine area vocational centers (AVC's). There were fifty-seven AVC's in operation at the time of this investigation; however, advisory member mailing data was not received from eight AVC's.

All reported advisory members were surveyed. Completed questionnaires were returned by 891 persons who identified themselves as advisory members. An additional 283 persons returned questionnaires with notation to the effect that they were not members of any advisory group. Another 133 questionnaires were returned by the post office as address unknown. Those not responding to the survey totaled 872 persons. The completed questionnaires amounted to a 41 percent response rate (Table 2).

Included among the returned questionnaires were 202 questionnaires with written comments by respondents. The majority of the written comments conveyed one of two messages. The first stated that the respondent was not a member of any committee and had no idea why he had received a survey questionnaire. The second stated that the respondent was contacted concerning advisory membership, but that he had not heard from the AVC since the initial contact. In some instances, more than two years had elapsed since the initial contact was made by the AVC (see appendix IV).

Analysis of individual member responses on a statewide basis revealed that the great majority of the individual respondents viewed their advisory group as having no impact on the vocational education programs which they served. Statewide, 70 percent of the respondents reported that their advisory group had no recommendations implemented. Less than one-third (30%) of the advisory members reported that recommendations had been made and implemented (Table 3).

Analysis of the data by advisory group provided almost identical results as discussed above for individual advisory members. The vast majority (68%) of the advisory groups had no recommendations implemented. Only thirty-two percent of the advisory groups reported that recommendations had been made and implemented (Table 6).

Area vocational centers (AVC's) varied widely concerning the impact made by advisory groups serving each center. A small percentage (6%) of the AVC's exhibited solely positive advisory groups. Fourteen AVC's (29%) exhibited solely negative advisory groups and two AVC's (4%) exhibited only neutral advisory groups. The remaining AVC's exhibited more than one type of advisory group (Table 8).

Data for two AVC's were compared to see if a difference in advisory group structure or operating procedures would be apparent. The two AVC's compared were chosen at random from two groups of AVC's that exhibited a majority of advisory groups as positive and negative. The results of this comparison are shown in Table 9. Table 9 indicated that advisory members, from the AVC with negative advisory groups, were unsure of fundamental information relating to their advisory group's functions. In sharp contrast, members of the advisory groups from the AVC with positive advisory groups were very sure of their answers to the same questions. One question examined, for both groups of advisory members, dealt with the determination of whether regular advisory group minutes were kept. Possible responses included yes, no, and not sure. Members of negative advisory groups were not sure in sixty percent of the cases. In contrast, members of the positive advisory groups were sure in all cases (Table 9).

The sharp contrast between respondents of positive and negative advisory groups from two AVC's was even more distinct when considering the responses of those committee members who were sure of what was happening. Members of positive advisory groups from one AVC reported that regular minutes were kept in ninety-two percent of the cases. Respondents from the AVC with all negative advisory groups reported that regular minutes were kept in only thirty-three percent of the cases. Advisory members of the AVC with positive advisory groups received written descriptions of their duties in sixty-one percent of the cases, whereas, members of the negative advisory groups received written descriptions of their duties in only thirty-one percent of the cases. Other differences in responses between advisory groups representing the two AVC's were apparent. Advisory members of positive advisory groups were more experienced in advisory group operations, their advisory group was

made up of fewer members, they had better member attendance at advisory meetings, the advisory group met more often, and the positive advisory group was subjected to more requests by education officials for help and suggestions than were the negative advisory groups. Another interesting difference noted was that the positive advisory groups utilized additional resources for improving advisory group operations in one hundred percent of the cases, whereas members of negative advisory groups reported that they utilized additional resources for advisory group improvement in twenty-seven percent of the cases.

Of particular interest in this investigation was the determination of whether there were identifiable differences in program impact as accomplished by advisory councils and advisory committees. A comparison of positive advisory councils and positive committees statewide was undertaken. The results indicated that several differences in advisory group operation existed. A much higher proportion of advisory councils were having an impact on educational programs as opposed to the accomplishments of advisory committees. A majority (53%) of advisory councils were rated as having an impact on educational programs versus twenty-three percent of the advisory committees (Table 10). Additionally, the proportion of non-functioning (negative) advisory groups exhibited by advisory councils and advisory committees was thirty-five percent and seventy-two percent respectively. Proportionately, more than twice as many advisory committees were non-functioning when compared to advisory councils. The non-functioning advisory groups did not have recommendations implemented, did not keep regular minutes, met less frequently than those groups that had recommendations implemented and members of these non-functioning advisory groups were not knowledgeable of their groups' basic functions.

The detailed comparison of the structure and activities of positive advisory councils and positive advisory committees revealed that substantial differences existed between the two groups concerning advisory group operations. The major differences noted in this comparison included: membership selection methods, advisory group chairman selection methods, frequency of contact by education officials and frequency of advisory group meetings. Table 11 displays the comparison of advisory councils and advisory committees. Following Table 11 is a detailed explanation of all differences noted.

Further data analysis involved the determination of the existence of differences in operating practices and/or structure among advisory councils. A comparison of advisory council operations revealed that numerous differences existed between positive councils and negative councils. These differences between councils are displayed in Table 12. A detailed interpretation of Table 12 immediately follows this table.

The primary differences in council operation noted during the comparison were that positive council members were generally more experienced advisory members, negative council members were unsure of what was happening concerning basic council structure and operations, more negative councils had employees of the center as chairmen of the councils, positive councils met more often and had a greater proportion of the council members present at the council meetings, positive council members were more knowledgeable of the reasons for the council's existence, and finally, positive councils had more requests from education officials for help and/or suggestions.

The final area of data analysis included a comparison of advisory committee operational procedures for all advisory committees. This was accomplished to determine if differences existed among advisory committees. The results of this comparison provided similar results as those discussed for differences among advisory councils. Negative advisory committee members were less experienced than were positive advisory committee members. Negative advisory committee members were very unsure of what was happening concerning their own committee's operations. In contrast, positive advisory committee members were much more knowledgeable of what was happening within their own committee. Table 13 displays the detailed comparison. An explanation of the comparison immediately follows Table 13.

Conclusions

The preceding section presented the summarized findings of this investigation as they relate to the central question posed in the problem. Several conclusions appear to be warranted based on the investigation. The conclusions are based on the static data gathered during the study, no projections were made.

The method chosen to recognize advisory group impact contains the possible weakness that advisory groups may have had an impact that this investigation did not reveal. By their very existence it is recognized

that advisory groups may exert influence and that educational programs may have been affected without overt recommendations being made and implemented. It is feasible to assume that advisory groups influence educational programs indirectly as well as directly. The impact that may have resulted because advisory groups exist but which were not directly identifiable are ignored in the following conclusions. For this investigation, only those advisory groups that were successful in having their recommendations implemented were considered to have had an impact on vocational education programs.

The conclusions of this investigation of the impact of advisory groups on vocational education programs in South Carolina are presented below. Users of the investigation should bear in mind the foregoing explanation of a possible weakness, the assumptions, definitions and delimitations presented in this chapter and preceding chapters.

Conclusions Relating to the Advisory Member Population Statewide

Advisory members generally appeared not to be having an impact on the vocational education programs in South Carolina.

1. Advisory members generally do not view their role of advisory member in a prestigious manner. A high proportion (40%) of the reported advisory member population did not complete a brief questionnaire relating to the advisory function. Over one-third of the reported advisory member population failed to respond to two separate requests for information on advisory group activities.
2. Advisory member records, as maintained by the area vocational centers, were apparently inaccurate in many cases and appeared to reflect a lack of attention by area vocational center officials. Thirteen percent of those persons identified by area vocational center directors two weeks prior to the survey responded to the survey by noting that they were not members of any advisory group. Additionally, another six percent of the survey questionnaires were returned by the post office as "address unknown."
3. A great majority of the reported advisory members were not having an impact on the educational programs. Analysis of returned questionnaires revealed that seventy percent of the reported advisory members had no recommendations implemented.

4. Advisory members in general were not performing the duties as prescribed in the Education Finance Act of 1977. Assuming that no education programs are perfect and therefore all educational programs could be improved, advisory members are not affecting educational programs as envisioned by federal and state legislation.
5. A majority (62%) of the reported advisory groups were non-functioning. Comments on returned questionnaires, non-member responses to the survey and survey questionnaires returned by the post office as "address unknown," strongly suggested that a large number of reported advisory groups existed on paper only. These groups were not functioning. Members of advisory groups classified as non-functioning were unable to answer the most basic questions concerning their advisory group's activities.

Conclusion Related to Advisory Committees

Advisory committees were having a minimal impact of vocational education programs in South Carolina.

1. The majority (77%) of the advisory committees statewide were not having an impact on the programs they served.
2. Less than one-quarter (23%) of the advisory committees were having an impact on vocational education programs.
3. The vast majority (72%) of the advisory committees statewide are non-functioning. A large number of these committees apparently exist on paper only. Many reported advisory members had not had communications with the area vocational center in over a year.

Conclusions Related to Area Vocational Centers

The impact on vocational education programs brought about by advisory committees serving area vocational centers varied considerably.

1. Area Vocational Centers varied widely on the inclusion of advisory groups in the decision-making process related to improvement of educational programs.
2. A substantial proportion (29%) of the area vocational center directors appeared not to be providing the leadership, encouragement, and support necessary for enthusiastic operation of the advisory groups serving these centers. These area vocational centers exhibited

non-functioning advisory groups. Several area vocational centers exhibited four, five and six non-functioning advisory groups. Conversely, several other area vocational centers exhibited solely positive advisory groups.

Conclusions Related to Advisory Councils

Advisory councils were the most successful advisory group relating to the question of impact on vocational education programs.

1. Advisory councils were operating more successfully than advisory committees. The majority (53%) of the advisory councils in operation were having an impact on vocational education programs versus only twenty-three percent of the advisory committees.
2. Apparently, all area vocational centers are not in compliance with federal and state directives that advisory councils be established. Data received in the survey suggested that six area vocational centers were not utilizing advisory councils. The same six centers had reported the use of advisory committees.
3. A sizable proportion (35%) of the advisory councils were classified as non-functioning councils. These councils appeared to exist on paper only and in fact were not operational to any extent.

Recommendations

The results of this investigation demonstrated that differences in successful advisory group operations were apparent for advisory councils, advisory committees, and area vocational centers.

The data derived through the survey of advisory members suggested that the following factors may be critical to the success or failure of advisory groups in South Carolina in having recommendations implemented. Based on these findings, the following factors appeared to be critical in achieving successful advisory group operation.

Recommendation #1

A statewide review of advisory council operations should be made to determine where the best practices and procedures are in use. From this review, a recommended set of standard advisory council procedures should be established statewide. The review

of advisory council operations should include, as a minimum, the following areas.

- Advisory Member Selection Methods
- Record Keeping Procedures
- Council Member Job Descriptions
- Council Member Term of Office
- Advisory Council Chairman Selection Criteria

Recommendation #2

The procedures recommended for advisory councils in Recommendation #1 should be accomplished for advisory committees statewide.

Recommendation #3

Advisory council members and advisory committee members term of office should be staggered to insure a minimum of a two year term. Additionally, the number of new advisory members (no previous advisory member experience) should be limited to insure that one-half or more of the advisory group consists of advisory members with at least one year's experience as an advisory member.

Recommendation #4

Area vocational center directors should be directly involved in the recruitment of advisory members.

Recommendation #5

Area vocational center directors should attend and participate in advisory group meetings.

Recommendation #6

Advisory groups should maintain written minutes of meetings. Copies of these minutes should be provided to district superintendents and area vocational center directors.

Recommendation #7

Advisory members should be provided with a written description of their duties and responsibilities. This job description should be specific as well as flexible.

Recommendation #8

Advisory members should be provided appropriate training in the various areas of responsibilities outlined in their written job descriptions. This training should be accomplished within six months of their initial appointment as an advisory member.

Recommendation #9

Advisory groups should establish a regular and frequent meeting schedule that will allow advisory members to adequately fulfill their written job descriptions.

Recommendation #10

The chairman of the advisory groups should not be an employee of the area vocational center.

Recommendation #11

An employee of each area vocational center should be assigned the responsibility of maintaining current and accurate information pertaining to advisory membership data.

Recommendation #12

A list of advisory group recommendations should be compiled semi-annually by each advisory group and submitted to the area vocational center director and district superintendent. The list of recommendations should include, as a minimum, a description of the recommendations, the date the recommendations were made, and the status of the recommendations.

Recommendation #13

A relatively small amount of funds should be made available, on a competitive basis, to advisory councils statewide. The funds would be used to support innovative ideas for program improvement.

Recommendations for Further Study

Recommendation #1

The data derived through this investigation did not provide adequate results relating to advisory group budgets. Further investigation in this area is warranted.

Recommendation #2

Data pertaining to the qualifications of advisory members was not produced through this investigation. This area warrants further investigation.

Recommendation #3

This investigation did not attempt to ascertain the indirect impact of advisory groups on education programs. Acknowledging that some indirect impact results simply because these groups exist and carry on operations further study as to the magnitude and direction of indirect impact generated by advisory groups is warranted.

Recommendation #4

Theoretically regular, formal performance evaluations have a positive impact on achieving mere effective advisory group performance. Further study as to feasibility and probable results of instituting such an evaluation program in South Carolina is warranted.

NOTE: TITLE, (PLACE: PUB, YEAR), P.#'s.

Indent same as paragraph

Source — Footnote

1. U.S., Congress, An Act to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation, to extend for three years the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and Public Laws 815 and 874. Eighty-first Congress (federally affected areas), and for other purposes, Pub.L. 88-210, 88th Congress, 1963, H.R. 4955, p.

2. U.S., Congress, An Act to extend the Higher Education Act of 1965, to extend and revise the Vocational Education Act of 1963, and for other purposes, Pub.L. 94-482, 94th Congress, 1976,

3. Citizens Advisory Committees: Current Trends in School Policies and Programs (Arlington, Va.: National School Public Relations Association, 1973), p.

4. South Carolina FY 1981: Administrative Provisions Vocational-Technical Education (S.C., Department of Education, 1981), p.

5. "A Call for Reform" (unpublished report, North Carolina Advisory Council on Education, E. Michael Latta and Jerauld B. Wright, August 18, 1978), page 32

6. "Vocational Education - A Decade of Progress" (unpublished legislative report, Tenth Annual Report of the Texas State Advisory Council, December 31, 1979), page 5

7. "Survey Study of Local Advisory Committees for Five Selected Curriculum Areas in the Technical Education Centers" (unpublished report, South Carolina State Advisory Council, August, 1974), page 4

8. "A Status Report on the Implementation of Section 6 on the Education Finance Act of 1977" (unpublished report by Joy E. Sovde, April, 1980), page 121 and 122

9. Clark Surratt, "Tax Decrease Not Favored, Survey Says," The State, (South Carolina), December 31, 1980

10. "Study of Implementation of the Education Finance Act of 1977" (unpublished legislative report, Legislative Audit Council, South Carolina General Assembly, December 16, 1980), page 104

11. "An Evaluation of Vocational Education" (unpublished report, Washington State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, Olympia, Washington, 1976), page

12. "Leading the Way: State Mandates for School Advisory Councils in California, Florida and South Carolina" (unpublished report, Ross Zerchykov, Don Davies, Janet Chrispeels, The Institute of Responsive Education, Massachusetts, November, 1980), page 6

13. School Administrators and Advisory Councils: Partnership or Shotgun Marriage (National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, January, 1980), Vol. 64, page

14. "Narrowing The Gap Between Intent and Practice: A Report to Policymakers for Community Organizations and School Decisionmaking" (unpublished report, by Kathleen Huguenin, Ross Zerchykov, Don Davies, prepared as part of Citizens Organizations: A study of Citizen Participation in Educational Decisionmaking by the Institute for Responsive Education for the Program on Educational Organizations and Local Communities of the National Institute of Education, Massachusetts, July, 1979), page

15. The Status Structure and Functions of Citizens Advisory Committees (by J.F. O'Neal, Journal of Education Research, September, 1961), Vol. 55, page 30

APPENDIX I

LETTER FROM THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE OHIO ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Ohio Advisory Council for Vocational Education

Dean Leonard M. Slominski, Chairman
Dr. Martin W. Essex, Executive Director

5900 Sharon Woods Boulevard
Columbus, Ohio 43229
(614) 891-4764

Dr. Lloyd W. Dull
Research Consultant

COUNCIL MEMBERS

Mr. William R. Burton
Wellington

Dr. Rondle E. Edwards
East Cleveland

Mrs. Beatrice C. Frame
Prospect

Dr. Keith E. Gainey
Parma

Mr. Joseph A. Hall
Cincinnati

Mrs. Roma Hess
Hamilton

Mr. E. W. Kavanagh
South Charleston

Mr. Frank Lamar
Lima

Mr. Ronald R. Lenhart
Columbus

Mr. Kenneth A. MacLaren
Toledo

Mr. Harrison L. Morris
Carroll

Miss Elizabeth J. Needles
Toledo

Mrs. Rose Mary O'Connor
Mineral City

Mrs. Grace J. Oikawa
Cincinnati

Mr. Raymond J. Puck
Chillicothe

Mr. Joseph Rafidi
Youngstown

Sr. Adrianna Schouten
Zanesville

Mr. Dean W. Simeral
Reynoldsburg

Mr. Leonard M. Slominski
Willoughby Hills

Mrs. Jeannine W. Stenson
Athens

Mrs. Ann L. Stephens
Lodi

Ms. Rochelle R. Stevenson
Springfield

Mr. Philip D. Weiser
Heath

December 18, 1980

Phil Latham
125 Holly Ridge Lane
West Columbia SC 29169

Dear Mr. Latham:

Perhaps the most specific response to recommendations would be exhibited through the Eleventh Annual Evaluation Report. Enclosed is a copy. You will note a section, which is carried in each annual report, stating the response of the State Board of Education to the Recommendations of the Advisory Council.

As you will determine, responses are normally in the affirmative. While State Superintendent of Public Instruction for more than a decade, I utilized the services of numerous committees. In fact, we had a volume which listed the various committees and collated them so we would not duplicate individuals on various assignments. One of these led to recommendations that the structure for teacher education in the 51 institutions be drastically redesigned. This was a citizens study that involved 120,000 persons and eight subcommittees.

The result may be the most farreaching development in American education as the redesign has been mandated through the State Board of Education into Standards, and funds have been appropriated by the State Ledgislature for the implementation of this vast operation. The first class under the completely restructured plan will graduate in 1984. Hence, it is in effect in the institutions at this time.

We have not conducted a study of the impact of advisory committees, but the evidence is available in nearly every phase of the operation of the Department of Education in Ohio.

(continued)

A brief of the teacher design is enclosed. Regrettably, it does not describe the process.

I trust that this information may be of some assistance to you.

Sincerely,

Martin

MARTIN W. ESSEX
Executive Director

MWE:tjh

Enclosures: (1) ✓Eleventh Annual Report of OACVE
(2) ✓Standards for Colleges and Universities Preparing Teachers
(3) ✓Citizens Advisory Councils brochure

P.S. 1) Enclosed also is a copy of a publication for Citizens Advisory Councils which may fit into your study.

M.W.E.

1) Enclosing copy of Tenth Annual Report also.

APPENDIX II

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

LOCAL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE POLL

Please fill out this survey and return it within seven (7) days in the enclosed envelope. If you are not a member of a local vocational education advisory committee or vocational craft committee, please check the box below and return the survey in the enclosed envelope.

☐

Please check the appropriate answer(s) for each of the following questions.

1. Your position.

   A. ____Committee Chairperson
   B. ____Committee Member

2. Your sex.

   A. ____Male
   B. ____Female

3. Your race.

   A. ____White (not of Hispanic origin)
   B. ____Black (not of Hispanic origin)
   C. ____Asian or Pacific Islander
   D. ____American Indian or Alaskan Native
   E. ____Hispanic

4. How long have you been a member of this committee?

   A. ____Less than six months
   B. ____Six months to one year
   C. ____One year to two years
   D. ____More than two years

5. Is your committee chairperson an employee of the vocational education center?

   A. ____Yes
   B. ____No
   C. ____Not sure

6. Number of persons on your committee.

   A. ____6 or fewer
   B. ____7 - 12
   C. ____13 or more
   D. ____Not sure

7. Average number of members in attendance at meetings during the past 12 months.

   A. ____1/3 of members or less
   B. ____1/3 to 1/2 of the members
   C. ____1/2 to 3/4 of the members
   D. ____Greater than 3/4 of the members
   E. ____Not sure

8. Number of meetings held in the past 12 months.

   A. ____Zero (no meetings)
   B. ____1 - 3
   C. ____4 - 6
   D. ____7 or more
   E. ____Not sure

9. Are regular minutes of meetings kept?

   A. ____Yes
   B. ____No
   C. ____Not sure

10. Did you receive a written description of your duties and responsibilities as a committee member?

    A. ____Yes
    B. ____No
    C. ____Not sure

11. Do you feel you know the reason for your committee's existence?

    A. ____Yes
    B. ____No
    C. ____Not sure

12. Are you confident that your advisory committee performs a worthwhile function?

    A. ____Not confident
    B. ____Confident
    C. ____Very confident

13. Has your committee made recommendations concerning the educational programs in the vocational education center?

    A. ____Yes
    B. ____No (If you check NO for this question, please skip to #17)

14. Please check the following area(s) that apply to committee. Column I is to be checked for those areas in which your committee made recommendations.

Column II is to be checked where appropriate to indicate those recommendations that will be or have been implemented.

	Column I	Column II	
A.	____	____	Assist in selection criteria for students
B.	____	____	Assist in selection criteria for faculty members
C.	____	____	Annually review and update skills needed by the person entering the occupation
D.	____	____	Support legislation favorable to your occupational area
E.	____	____	Provide occupational information to vocational center officials
F.	____	____	Serve as a communications channel between the vocational center and the community
G.	____	____	Assist in the evaluation of the educational programs directly related to your committee
H.	____	____	Assist in the evaluation of the graduates
I.	____	____	Program budget development
J.	____	____	Development of long and short range plans
K.	____	____	Aid in the recruitment of students
L.	____	____	Aid the school in placement of students
M.	____	____	Aid in determining course offering
N.	____	____	Aid in determining course length
O.	____	____	Aid in determining course content
P.	____	____	Other - please list using back if necessary

_____

_____

_____

_____

15. Recommendations indicated in Column I, above, are in:

A. ____Verbal form
B. ____Written form
C. ____Both

16. To whom are your committee's recommendations made? Check as many as are applicable.

A. ____School Superintendent
B. ____School Board Member
C. ____Center Director
D. ____Program Instructor
E. ____Instructor/Faculty Member
F. ____Other - please list _____

_____

17. Have vocational center officials asked your committee for help or suggestions?

A. ____Yes
B. ____No

18. What education officials have attended your advisory committee meetings?

A. ____None have attended any meetings
B. ____Center Director
C. ____Program Instructor
D. ____State Official
E. ____School Superintendent
F. ____School Board Member

19. Please estimate the total number of hours of contact you have had with vocational center employees in conjuction with your duties as a committee member in a calendar year.

A. _____Total estimated contact hours in a calendar year

20. Indicate the position of the person who contacted you concerning committee membership.

A. ____Center Director
B. ____Program Instructor
C. ____State Official
D. ____Other Committee Member
E. ____School Superintendent
F. ____Committee Chairperson
G. ____School Board Member
H. ____Other - please specify

_____

_____

21. Are any vocational center funds used to support your committee activities (including mailings, dinners, travel expenses, etc.)?

A. ____Yes
B. ____No
C. ____Not sure

22. What is your committee's typical expenditure for these items on a yearly basis?

A. ____We have no budget
B. ____Less than $200 annually
C. ____From $200 to $500 annually
D. ____$500 to $1,000
E. ____$1,000 to $2,000
F. ____Greater than $2,000
G. ____Not sure

23. Please indicate what resources your committee has used to improve your operating effectiveness.

A. ____Literature provided by the vocational center
B. ____Written guidelines of duties and responsibilities provided by the vocational center
C. ____Participation in faculty training sessions
D. ____Guest Speaker
E. ____Training sessions/workshop sessions sponsored by the vocational education center
F. ____Participation in various school activities such as open house, discussions with students, etc.
G. ____Have not used any resources for improvement
H. ____Other - please list

_____

_____

24. Have you heard of the State Advisory Council for Technical & Vocational Education (SACVTE)?

A. ____Yes
B. ____No

25. Are you aware that the SACVTE will provide technical assistance upon request to the local advisory councils for their operation?

A. ____Yes
B. ____No

26. Has your committee requested such help from the SACVTE?

A. ____Yes
B. ____No, but feel help is needed
C. ____No, help not needed
D. ____Not sure

APPENDIX III

ADVISORY COMMITTEE CLASSIFICATION

CODE	COMMITTEE
1	Advisory Councils
2	Distributive Education
3	Health Occupations
4	Consumer and Homemaking
5	Occupational Home Economics
6	Office Occupations
7	Trade and Industrial
8	Pre-vocational
9	Industrial Arts
10	Guidance and Placement
11	Mentally Handicapped
99	Other

APPENDIX IV

COMMENTS ADDED TO QUESTIONNAIRES BY REPORTED ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

1. Several questionnaires were returned by family members of deceased, former advisory committee members. In one instance the deceased member had been dead for more than seven months.

2. Numerous questionnaires contained comments that indicated that the respondent had been asked to serve on an advisory committee and had not heard from the area vocational center since. In some cases, as much as two years had elapsed since the initial contact by area vocational centers.

3. Other questionnaires were returned by respondents who had moved out of the state. Some had moved as long as a year before the survey.

4. Still another category of questionnaires received contained comments to the effect "I do not know what you are talking about. As far as I know, I am not a member of any such committee."

5. One advisory member responded with comments saying that only one meeting had been held in the past twelve months. Total contact time with the area vocational center had been thirty minutes.

6. Many respondents indicated that they would like to serve on the advisory committees but that they had not been called after the initial contact with the center.

7. Several written comments noted that "the school is doing a fine job."

8. *Areas in which advisory members provided written responses indicated that recommendations had been made in the following areas.

    1. programs for handicapped individuals
    2. programs to up-grade academic skills
    3. programs to improve student performance on certification tests
    4. recommendations concerning up-grading of facilities

5. recommendations concerning maintenance and grounds keeping
6. recommendations for on the job training programs
7. recommendations of new course offerings

* These areas of recommendation were the result of written comments added to the questionnaires.

APPENDIX V

LETTER TO ADVISORY MEMBERS
SOLICITING THEIR RESPONSE TO THE SURVEY

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
COLUMBIA 29201

Charlie G. Williams
State Superintendent of Education

Dear Committee Member:

The Office of Vocational Education is presently attempting to determine the extent of involvement by citizens, such as yourself, in vocational education center programs. Your cooperation is needed in filling out the attached questionnaire.

From this survey, the Office of Vocational Education will attempt to determine just what it is that makes a local advisory council or craft committee effective, so that the educational system for the students of South Carolina can be improved upon for the benefit of us all.

Your identity will, of course, be kept strictly confidential, but your participation is essential. Please help by filling out the attached questionnaire and returning it in the envelope which has been enclosed for your convenience.

If the Office of Vocational Education may be of help in completing the questionnaire, please call (803) 758-2358, and ask for Ms. Pamela Kegley.

With best regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

Moody Oswald, Director
Office of Vocational Education

cs

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Articles

Brinkley, J., "Making Parent Councils Effective." Citizen Action in Education, Vol 7, No 1, (April 1980).

Burris, G.L., "Success Areas of High School Parent Advisory Councils." American Secondary Education, (April 1980).

Burt, S.M., "What Is Your Advisory Committee Doing." American Vocational Journal, Vol 40 (May 1965).

Davies, Don, "School Administrators and Advisory Councils: Partnership or Shotgun Marriage." NASSP Bulletin, Vol 64 (January, 1980).

Howard, K., "Successful Use of Advisory Committees." Agriculture Education, Vol 43 (August, 1970).

Mann, Dale, "Public Understanding and Education Decision-Making." Educational Administration Quarterly, Vol 10, No 2, (1974)

Nelson, J.L., "200 Advisors Serve Trade Tech." American Vocational Journal, (May, 1965)

Odell, H.A., "Lay Advisory Committee: Summary of a Presentation." NASSP Bulletin, Vol 38 (April, 1954).

O'Neal, J.F., "The Status Structure and Functions of Citizens Advisory Committees." Journal of Education Research, Vol 55, (September, 1961).

Ransy, W.L., "Case History From One of the World's Largest Vocational Technical Schools; Advisory Committees In An Urban Setting." American Vocational Journal, Vol 52, (April, 1977).

Rodgers, J., "Advisory Committees a Key to Program Success." Agriculture Education, Vol 52 (October, 1979)

Sherck, C.P., "Impact of St. Louis Advisory Committees." American Vocational Journal, Vol 47 (April, 1972)

Walter, J.E.; McCall, J.D., "Citizen Committees Can Make A Difference." School and Community, Vol 62 (May, 1976).

Weiler, W.G., "Our Advisory Council Has Helped Us." Agriculture Education Magazine, Vol 26 (April, 1954).

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Unpublished Reports

Citizen's Coalition on South Carolina School Financing, "The South Carolina Education Finance Act of 1977." July 1977

Huguenin, K.; Zerchykov, R.; and Davies, D. "Narrowing the Gap Between Intent and Practice: A Report to Policymakers on Community Organizations and School Decision-Making." July, 1979.

Iowa Vocational Education Advisory Council, "Quantity and Quality - The Status of Local Advisory Councils in Iowa In 1978." 1979.

Kentucky State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, "Vocational Education in Kentucky; 8th Annual Evaluation Report." December 1977.

Kentucky State Advisory Council for Vocational Education, "Kentucky Advisory Committee Evaluation System." 1977.

Latta, M.E.; Wright, J.B.; "A Call for Reform." August, 1978.

Lawyer's Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, "Achieving Sex Equality in Vocational Education.", 1976.

Legislative Audit Council. "Study of Implementation of the Education Finance Act of 1977." December, 1980.

National School Public Relations Association, "Citizens Advisory Committees: Current Trends in School Policies and Programs.", 1973.

New Jersey Advisory Council on Vocational Education, "Structure, Function and Effectiveness of Local Advisory Committees Serving Vocational Education in New Jersey." 1971.

Schultz, Jerelym B. "Effectiveness of Postsecondary Vocational Education Advisory Councils." April, 1980.

Skupin, Joseph F. "A Follow-up Study of the Development and Implementation of an In-Service Training Dealing With the Use of Advisory Committees In Michigan's Vocational Education Programs." 1975.

South Carolina State Department of Education, "Suggestions for Principals As They Work With Advisory Councils." 1978.

South Carolina State Advisory Council. "Survey Study of Local Advisory Committees for Area Vocational Education Centers." August, 1974.

Sovde, Joy E. "A Status Report on the Implementation of Section 6 on the Education Finance Act of 1977."

Texas State Advisory Council, "Vocational Education - A Decade of Progress." December, 1979.

Washington State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, " An Evaluation of Vocational Education." 1976.

Zerchykov, R.; Davies, D.; and Chrispeels, J. "Leading the Way: State Mandates for School Advisory Councils in California, Florida and South Carolina." August, 1980.

Government Publications

U.S., Congress, An Act to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation, to extend for three years the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and Public Law 815 and 874. Pub. L. 88-210, 88th Congress, H.R. 4955.

U.S., Congress, An Act to extend the Higher Education Act of 1965, to extend and revise the Vocational Education Act of 1963, Pub. L. 94-482, 94th Congress.

News Paper Article

The State Newspaper. "Tax Decrease Not Favored, Survey Says." December 31, 1980.

Yearbooks

South Carolina Department of Education, "South Carolina FY 1981: Administrative Provisions Vocational - Technical Education." August, 1980.